

## A PHILOSOPHICAL ANALYSIS OF THE CONCEPT OF SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

ERNESTA MOLOTOKIENĖ<sup>1</sup>

Klaipėda University (Lithuania)

### ABSTRACT

The main aim of the research is to reveal the philosophical foundations of the concept of sustainable development. The scope of this research includes an analysis of the philosophical meaning of the concept of sustainable development, focusing on the revealing of the synergy of metaphysical, ethical and ecological parameters of this concept. To give a deeper understanding about different opinions and approaches to sustainable development, there will be an interpretation of some theoretical perspective both about sustainable development and also about different philosophical theories and how they are related sustainable development. The concept of sustainable development is not only concerned with the well-being of people but also of the world where human live, therefore the concept of sustainable development can be understood as holistic philosophy that includes classical philosophical prospects as well as harmonizes and integrates the activities of economic, sociopolitical and ecological system. Therefore, in this article are raised concrete tasks: to analyze the literature and reveal the philosophical context of the formation of the concept of sustainable development; to analyze classical ethical philosophical theories and argue their significance for the concept of sustainable development; to analyze a holistic philosophical approach and to argue its significance for the concept of sustainable development.

KEY WORDS: *philosophy, sustainable development, ethical theories.*

JEL CODES: B30, B55, D60, D78, I31

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.15181/rfds.v31i2.2106>

### Introduction

The concept of sustainable development has become a specific point of reference for a welfare society, referring in many respects to the concept of ‘arche’, or the beginning, of the classical ancient Greek philosophers. Problems faced by the concept of sustainable development, such as the consequences and evaluation of human actions in the world, or attitudes towards and preservation of natural resources for future generations, responsible presence in the world, etc., are fundamentally related to various philosophical theories. Therefore it is important to explore different philosophical theories and their relationship to the concept of sustainable development.

To give a deeper understanding about different opinions and approaches to sustainable development, there will be an interpretation of some theoretical perspective both about sustainable development and also about different philosophical theories and how they are related sustainable development. We proceed to draw on classical philosophical ethical theories to argue the predominance of these classical philosophical value priorities and to explore which mindshifts are required to develop a more comprehensive understanding of what is needed to enable sustainable development.

**Purpose.** The main purpose of the research is to reveal the philosophical foundations of the concept of sustainable development.

---

<sup>1</sup> Ernesta Molotkienė – Ph. D., (Assoc. Prof.), Klaipėda University, Faculty of Social Sciences and Humanities, Department of Philosophy, Arts and Communication  
Scientific interests: history of philosophy, contemporary ethics, logics, innovation  
E-mail: [irama@inbox.lt](mailto:irama@inbox.lt)

**Problem.** The concept of sustainable development is not only concerned with the well-being of people but also of the world where human live, therefore the concept of sustainable development can be understood as holistic philosophy that includes classical philosophical prospects as well as harmonizes and integrates the activities of economic, sociopolitical and ecological system.

**Object.** The scope of this research includes an analysis of the philosophical meaning of the concept of sustainable development, focusing on the revealing of the synergy of metaphysical, ethical and ecological parameters of this concept.

**Tasks.** To analyze the literature and reveal the philosophical context of the formation of the concept of sustainable development; to analyze classical ethical philosophical theories and argue their significance for the concept of sustainable development; to analyze a holistic philosophical approach and to argue its significance for the concept of sustainable development.

**Methods.** In this article are applied theoretical philosophical methods: systematic scientific literature analysis; method of theoretical comparative analysis; method of critical text reconstruction; method of theoretical generalization. These methods ensure the achievement of the goal of the article and the realization of the set tasks.

## 1. On substantiating the philosophical meaning of the concept of sustainable development

The foundation of sustainable development is first and foremost about a harmonious, long-lasting person and the pursuit of prosperity for all people. Such a general meaning does not contradict the current concept of sustainable development concepts. However, it is in itself contradictory, as the separate words 'sustainability' and 'development' are the opposite. The philosophical context of these concepts is the unchanging of this contradiction, as well as the basic, which has established a clear order of distinction between what is stability, and what is legitimacy. The tension between sustainability and development is one of the most important philosophical ideas, contemplated by the sages of ancient cultures, ancient philosophers and modern thinkers. (Lele, 1991; Sachs, 2010). The fundamental nature of the concept of sustainable development is especially evident when remembering that human thinking itself is possible only because of the ability to operate on differences, because we are able to draw boundaries between more or less different things in our thinking.

The beginnings of the concept of sustainable development can already be seen in ancient cultures, which saw the connection between the oppositions of permanence and instability and order, and perceived the emergence of the world as a cosmic order as a kind of constraint on boundless primordial chaos. Already in the ancient tradition of Chinese thought, a moment of sustainable cosmic development is recorded, when the primordial boundless Dao gives birth to himself as pure sustainability, from which heaven and earth are later derived. In other words, by giving birth to himself in a different form, namely, as a sustainable movement, Dao limits himself, and the result of this restriction is the cosmic world order.

The ancient Jews regarded the boundary (sustainability) as one of the three principles constituting reality, alongside letter and number. One might think that the ancient Jews thought that Yahweh was creating the world in some way by limiting the fullness of his divine being. The being of the world is like a limited being of God himself or an overcome of sustainability. Since God, in creating the world by the limitation of his being, does not create the world specifically from anything, such an idea of divine creation is not fundamentally contrary to the principle of creation from nothing (*ex nihilo*), which is more emphasized in Christian theology.

However, of all the ancient peoples, it was the Greeks who best understood the importance of sustainable development. Most Greek philosophers believed that an orderly and sustainable world (*cosmos*) arises when the boundary (*peras*) in some way limits the primordial infinity (*apeiron*) and the development of space becomes rational. Being perceived by the Greeks not as a boundary but as a result of the *apeiron* (expansion) constraint boundary, as a certain connection or intersection of boundary and infinity, that is, sustainability. Thinking about sustainable development (*arche*) in one form or another is found in the texts of almost all Greek philosophers, especially pre-Socratics. Being, as a result of the interaction between boundary and infinity, or as sustainable development, is perceived very similarly by Plato and Aristotle.

The ancient Greeks emphasized the need to confine oneself to the boundaries set and thus to overcome sustainable development. Ethical behavior for the Greeks is respecting the boundaries of the ethical territory (*ēthos*). In turn, lawful, legal behavior is perceived as not exceeding the boundaries of the territory marked by law (*nomos*). Plato and Aristotle even foresee certain limits of population and territory and sustainability, which would have to be respected by the founders of ideal or equivalent real city-states. One of the traditional four Greek virtues, namely the virtue of moderation (*sōphrosunē*), was directly related to man's ability to respect boundaries and maintain sustainability. Interestingly, Plato also linked the virtue of justice (*dikaio-sunē*) to sustainability: perceiving justice as a combination of the remaining three virtues, wisdom (*sophia*), courage (*andreia*), and moderation (*sōphrosunē*), in the right proportions. Similarly, Aristotle perceives ethical virtue as a kind of moderate, sustainable middle ground between extremes of wickedness.

In the transition period from antiquity to the Middle Ages, early Christian theologians spoke of the insurmountable boundary between God and his creations, finally establishing the concept of the sustainability of the absolute transcendence of God in relation to the world he created. In the new ages, especially with the beginning of Descartes, an attempt has been made to draw a strict distinction between absolutely real, sustainable knowledge, which is no longer in doubt, and all other, insufficiently reliable, dynamic, unpredictable knowledge. Descartes, and subsequently other philosophers, sought to achieve greater efficiency and sustainability in thinking by limiting thinking within the framework of the method. Still later, Kant saw the problem of insurmountable, sustainable boundaries of cognition. According to him, thinking is able to formulate metaphysical questions that it is no longer able to solve – not because of a lack of facts, but because of the nature of thinking itself. Hegel's dialectic, operating on the thesis-antithesis-synthesis triad, can be interpreted as an attempt to erase, at least in part, the strict distinction between sustainability and development based on synthesis. Darwin's theory of evolution erases the previously unquestioned strict division between humans and other animals, and, by enshrining a sustainable, dynamic concept of biological species development, generally abolishes insurmountable boundaries between individual species. The name Nietzsche is associated with a rebellion against rationality and thus with the idea of sustainable development in general.

At the beginning of the twentieth century, psychoanalysis began to reflect on the mental integrity and unsustainability of the subject, on radical differences between different layers of the psyche, on a new division between consciousness and the subconscious, and on divisions between personality levels called Id, Ego, and Superego. Husserl, like Descartes, once again, in a somewhat different, much more subtle way, again attempts to discover sustainability, stability, and certainty between absolute obviousness and derived, implicit knowledge. In Heidegger's thinking, the problems of sustainability and development can be seen in his reflections on the nature of language as a home: language is able to reveal certain things to us only because at the same time it is able to hide other things, in other words, the source of our sustainable existence. Language, by giving us a worldview, gives us sustainability and places us in a cozy home of being, whose limits of development are at the same time the limits of our own being as constituted beings of language. Moreover, Heidegger emphatically emphasizes the finiteness of man, so that in his thinking death emerges as insurmountable, the absolute limit of finite human existence and the horizon of sustainability. Sartre begins to speak of the supposed absolute freedom of man as a source of sustainable development and of man as a project of his own constant creation and realization, but draws such strict, truly insurmountable boundaries between individuals that human freedom is essentially perceived as existence in prison. the freedom of a closed, incapable of loving a solipsist.

The last three decades of the 20th century are marked by the philosophical challenges of postmodernism. Postmodernism, especially its aggressive forms, began not only to falter in traditional metaphysics, but also to rebel against thinking itself, against the very essential powers of thinking that, as we mentioned at the beginning of this article, are concerned with seeing boundaries. By promoting constant radical transgression, transcending the boundaries of social acceptability both in art and in all other spheres of life, postmodernism has at the same time largely abandoned social dialogue and imprisoned people and certain social and cultural groups in their diversity, drawing insurmountable boundaries between social and cultural ghettos. Thus, in an attempt to destroy the boundaries that had been drawn by tradition and classical thinking, other boundaries that had not previously existed that separated and twisted individuals and their groups even more were ina-

divertently drawn. Postmodernism, in trying to establish the autonomy of the individual at any cost, has only made it even more vulnerable, even more alienated, and even more dependent. More recently, philosophers have been criticizing the approach of modernist philosophy to the world around us. Ever since philosophy began to ignore the natural world, many theories of ethics have held man to be of greatest value. In this context, a worldview of ecophilosophy based on the ethical principles of holism is formed.

## 2. The Impact of Classical Philosophical Ethical Utilitarian and Deontological Theories on the Concept of Sustainability

The issues of sustainability are connected to different philosophical theories. Normative theories can be divided into two main groups. Normative ethics examines the principles of how to live. It analyzes the basic principles of wrong and right actions, what constitutes the value of life, what a just society would be. Thus, normative ethical theory not only examines, but also presents the most general moral principles to be followed. Modern, applied ethics, which includes various problems arising in specific areas of human activity, naturally follows from normative ethics. Teleological ethics basically states that no matter what you do, do what ensures the best consequences. Deontological ethics basically states that certain actions (e.g., murder, lies, etc.) are bad in themselves, not because they cause bad consequences. The main disagreement between these two theories of normative ethics is the question of whether only consequences define right and wrong actions? This is a key question of normative ethics, on which the methods for solving the problems of applied ethics depend (Kymlicka, 1995).

The principle of teleological ethics was most clearly expressed in the classical utilitarianism developed by J. Bentham and J. S. Mill, stating that we must do what “maximizes” the amount of pleasure and “minimizes” the amount of suffering for everyone affected by our actions. The real purpose of morality for utilitarians is to ensure happiness and eliminate suffering. Utilitarians take the position that we can achieve objective morality by considering the consequences of one action or another. The ethics of consequences can take many forms, which sometimes differ substantially. It is not agreed whether it is appropriate to choose the one that guarantees the best consequences for myself (egoism), for each participant in the situation (classical utilitarianism), or to count good only in terms of pleasure and discomfort (hedonism) or various goods (pluralism). questions of utilitarian ethics related to the justification of the concept of sustainable development are as follows: whose goodness we must guarantee, i. y. ourselves, the group to which we belong, all humanity, or all conscious beings? According to hedonism, there is only pleasure as good in itself (independent of external circumstances and subsequent consequences) and suffering as evil in itself. The first theorist and practitioner of hedonism, Epicurus emphasized the importance of a long, pleasant life, arguing pleasure as the absence of suffering. Long-term pleasure, according to ancient hedonists, is such a physical and mental state when the body is healthy and passions are harmoniously balanced. Such long-lasting pleasure is ataraxia, i. a state of life without shocks (Hansson, 2002). While utilitarian thinking stands for the happiness of all people, it is constantly emphasized that this line of ethics has such side effects that it is difficult to accept for mature moral thinking. One of the most criticized places of utilitarianism is that utilitarianism allows one to harm the individual if it provides a more general good (Ariansen, 1993). However, classical utilitarian ethical theory is indeed easily compatible with the idea of sustainable development, which overcomes the interests of all mankind. According to the utilitarian justification of the concept of sustainable development, it follows that the interests of the individual are less significant than those of all humanity.

The basic principle of deontological ethics (ethics of duties) states that certain actions (more precisely, their types) are bad in themselves, and not because they cause bad consequences. Deontologists take the position that any theory of the ethics of consequences is ultimately incapable of fully expressing and protecting the incomparable value of the individual, and thus of describing true evil. At the beginning of the modern age, the idea that morality is based on factors beyond human reality is gradually abandoned. The idea is formulated that the only reasonable and comprehensible source of morality is the autonomy of man himself. This approach is born in M. Montaigne’s philosophy and culminates in I. Kant’s treatises, which raise ideas

and form a tradition of deontological ethics. From a deontological point of view, we are not responsible for the foreseeable consequences, so for intent. Unlike non-consequence ethics, action may be acceptable even if it is not the best, or even a good solution. The ethics of consequences theoretically define evil quite clearly – to behave badly means to give more harm than necessary. According to deontologists, such actions are bad in themselves and do not require ‘calculating’ their moral value. Deontologists often appeal to tradition or innate moral intuition by defining inherently bad things (whose moral status is not determined by the consequences). Sometimes they are derived from a basic principle, such as Kant’s statement that one must first respect oneself and the other as ‘rational’ beings (Grøn, et al., 1988). The purpose of deontological morality is to avoid evil. A sincere effort is enough for that. From a deontological point of view, bad things are already clearly defined before any real situation. This means that deontology is guided by a ‘legalistic’ understanding of morality, according to which the most important thing is not to break the rules. The advantages of such a ‘legalistic’ approach to morality are that it is clear, easy to maintain, has little restriction on privacy, and is easy to obey. It is clear that the rationale for the concept of sustainable development, based on classical deontological ethical theory, is possible if each individual takes responsibility for his or her actions and adheres to a common categorical imperative of not deliberately misbehaving and preventing destruction (Ariansen, 1993). According to Kant, the basic duty of man is, in principle, to obey the categorical imperative as a principle of conscience and a condition of human freedom and dignity. A person who adheres to the categorical imperative fully exercises his or her freedom, rises above the usual set of external circumstances and stimuli, individually realizing the idea of sustainable development.

Within the utilitarian theories, which aim at maximizing the total utility, it is definitely possible to see a connection with sustainable development. Since the utilitarianism see all human beings and sometimes also nonhuman beings as equal bearers of utility, it is possible to argue that we have the same responsibility for future generation as for the present. When talking about weak versus strong sustainability and whether it is possible or not to substitute natural resources with man-made capital, a utilitarian solution would be to do utility calculations. If we instead talking about, for example conserving natural resources because it is a duty or a virtue, we are talking about non-consequentialist ethical theories. One of the non-consequentialist ethical theories which are related to sustainable development is the holistic environmental (ecological) ethics which requires to reveal a meaning of philosophical holistic approach to the concept of sustainable development.

### 3. The Meaning of Philosophical Holistic Approach to the Concept of Sustainable Development

The United Nations World Commission on Environment and Development coined a definition of sustainable development, which is probably the most well-known in all of sustainability literature: “development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs” (WECD, 1987). Recently, the concept of sustainable development has become very broad, but in practice it has three dimensions – economic, environmental and social. The term sustainability literally means “a capacity to maintain some entity, outcome, or process over time” (Jenkins, 2009: 380) and carrying out activities that do not exhaust the resources on which that capacity depends. Since this is a general understanding of sustainability, this meaning can be placed analogously to all human activities. However, Shiva (2010: 240) points out that the general understanding of sustainability is dangerous because it does not respect the environmental limits and the need for adapting human activities to the sustainability of natural systems. Natural systems enable people to live and support the outcomes of human activities, therefore sustainability can hardly be considered without an ecological aspect (Jenkins, 2009; Sachs, 2010; Shiva, 2010).

As the concept of sustainable development faces economic, social and cultural constraints, it can be said that sustainability is a normative ethical principle for the further development of society. In the second half of the twentieth century, due to the constantly rapidly changing ecological situation, a more consistent study of the relationship between man and nature was started. The creators of ecological ethics have realized that traditional theories of ethics are not sufficient to substantiate the relationship between man and nature. In this



context, a holistic interpretation of the human approach to nature emerges, which proposes new principles of ecological ethics for the analysis of this relationship.

Linguistically, the word “holism” was used in 1926 in the book “Holism and Evolution” by South African thinker Jan Christian Smuts. This word comes from the Greek word “cave” (as a whole). Traditionally, three strands of the holistic concept are distinguished: ethical holism. This position refutes ethical reductionism, which understands the well-being of a species as the sum of the well-being of individual members of the species. Second, epistemological holism. It is the view that knowledge of parts of the whole is neither necessary nor sufficient to know the whole. This approach refutes epistemological reductionism, which states that we perceive the whole by knowing parts of the whole. Third, metaphysical (ontological) holism. This view argues that the whole does not exist independently of its constituent parts. The concept of holism in ecological ethics is derived from Ald Leopold’s book “A Sand County Almanac” (1949). Central to this concept is the integrity and sustainability of the entire system or the entire environment. The holistic approach is completely non-anthropocentric, in other words, it is a holistic approach, encompassing species, ecosystems, each of which exists on its own, and must therefore be taken into account morally. Ecological holism in this sense is a non-anthropocentric worldview, claiming that by knowing the whole community of life, we discover the functions of the whole that enhance sustainability (Partridge, 1984). According to Van Steenberg, the holistic paradigm emphasizes totality, the replacement of the observer by the participant, thinking in terms of processes, an affinity with systems theory and ecologism (Van Steenberg, 1990).

The environment (nature) has an intrinsic value. This position was presented and argued by Immanuel Kant. He deliberately applied this concept to rational, conscious moral subjects who could not only assume moral rights but also moral duties. Thus, the criterion of intrinsic value was rationality. Another important aspect of the concept of holism is biocentric egalitarianism, which argues that every living organism has an equal right to live and prosper and to achieve its own self-realization in the greater self-realization of the forms of the whole (Naess, 1973). Thus, the principle of equality is granted to all living beings on Earth.

Chet A. Bowers (1996) points to certain cultural assumptions, which he calls the myths of modernity, and which have a direct bearing on our approach to nature. First, the abundance and over-consumption of consumer goods; second, the individual is the basic social unit that makes rational and moral decisions; third, science and technology are constantly expanding humanity’s ability to predict and control their destiny (Bowers, 1996: 6). It is clear that liberal capitalist presuppositions, together with religion and science, have the power to penetrate the thinking of the individual, which does not allow the incorporation of ecological holism into their worldview and into everyday moral practice. These myths of modernity deny the very essence of holism.

Clearly, the only solution in this situation is a deep understanding of the concept of sustainable development, enabling changes in the structure of the system. We will only be able to successfully tackle environmental problems if all economic, political and social mechanisms are regulated in a way that promotes advanced, environmentally friendly technologies and environmentally friendly behavior for all of us (Barbour, 1996). It is therefore important to emphasize not only the economic and ecological but also the moral aspect of sustainable development. Now, in the age of globalization, people are gradually becoming aware of the destructive processes of globalization and seeking to stem them by creating a different vision of globalization based on the principles of sustainable development, taking into account not only economic indicators but also social and ecological sustainability. By not accepting man as a value for ourselves and others, we threaten to receive an aggressive response. By destroying the environment, we are destroying ourselves (Agyeman, Bullard, Evans, 2003; Engel, 2002). But now the classical worldview, in which everything around is alive and valuable, in which the environment is a subject rather than an object, is gradually coming to life in the human subconscious by mobilizing active change.

What this issues implies, in relation to sustainable development is that the material world is not natural as it seems but is a human construction. The concept of sustainable development as an alternative philosophical paradigm requires a shift in types of moral reasoning (Harrison, 1996). Sustainable development is defined as a new holistic ethics in which economic growth and environmental protection go hand-in-hand around the

world. The moral philosophy of sustainable development views sustainable development as a holistic ethic that asserts the supremacy of the value of the ecological system (Holly, 2006). Human beings, both individually and collectively, are always involved in a continuing process of progression or the search for human development. Therefore the deep philosophical meaning of the concept of sustainable development is a holistic ethics that harmonizes and integrates the activities of economic, socio-political and ecological systems.

## Conclusions

Sustainable development should provide a solution in terms of meeting basic human needs, integrating environmental development and protection, achieving equality, ensuring social self-determination and cultural diversity, and maintaining ecological integrity. Although the concept of sustainable development has undergone certain changes during the past, its fundamental philosophical principles and goals have contributed to a more conscious behavior adapted to the limitations of the environment. This is the reason of adopting the concept in different areas of human activities.

Such a meaning of the concept of sustainable development is, however, vague and deficient. Its commitment to economic growth and environmental protection appears contradictory, and its focus on basic needs and equity are philosophically objectionable. Thus, the need for a philosophical dialogue on the meaning and implications of the concept. The concept of sustainable development emerged from philosophical knowledge.

The sustainable social well-being is impossible without ethical values that ensure the prosperity and sustainability of society as a whole. Classical ethical theories can help to make concrete decisions that ensure sustainable development. Within the classical ethical utilitarian theories, which aim at maximizing the total utility, it is definitely possible to see a connection with sustainable development. Since the utilitarianism see all human beings and sometimes also nonhuman beings as equal bearers of utility, it is possible to argue that we have the same responsibility for future generation as for the present. Within the deontological ethical theories, actions are valued not by their consequences but rather by whether they are made with a good intention, if they are possible to place in a set of rules and also on different kinds of duties and virtues.

The moral philosophy of sustainable development views sustainable development as a holistic ethics that asserts the supremacy of the value of the ecological system over the economic system. Holistic philosophy promotes fundamental human needs and grounds them with human rights. Fundamental human needs are based on human rights, therefore sustainable development is the fulfillment of the rights of all peoples at all times. Sustainable development implies the enhancement of the well-being of all peoples always by providing a world fit for human habitation. Sustainable development is a holistic philosophy that harmonizes and integrates the activities of economic, socio-political and ecological systems.

## References

- Agyeman, J., Bullard, R. D., Evans, B. (2003). Joined-up Thinking: Bringing Together Sustainability, Environmental Justice and Equity. *Just Sustainabilities – Development in an Unequal World*, p. 1–16. Cambridge: MIT-Press.
- Ariansen, P. (1993). *Miljöfilosofi*. Nora: Nya Doga.
- Barbour, M. (1996). Ecological Fragmentation in the Fifties. *Uncommon Ground Rethinking the Human Place in Nature*. William Cronon (ed.). New York and London: W. W. Norton and Company.
- Bowers, C. A. (1996). The cultural dimensions of ecological literacy. *Journal of Environmental Education*, Vol. 27 (2), p. 5–11.
- Engel, R. J. (2002). Ethics of Sustainable Development. *Ethics of Environment and Development. Global Challenge and International Response*. Cambridge: MIT-Press.
- Grøn, A., Husted, J., Sandøe, P., Lübcke, P., Alstrup Rasmussen, S., Stefansen, N., Bengtsson, J. (1988). *Filosofilexikonet*. Stockholm: Bokförlaget Forum AB.
- Harrison, P. R. (1996). Towards a Philosophy of Nature. *Uncommon Ground. Rethinking the Human Place in Nature*. William Cronon (ed.). New York and London: W. W. Norton and Company.
- Hassan, A. M. (2002). Sustainable development: between development and environmental agendas in the developing world. In R. Z. White. *Planning in Cities: Sustainability and Growth in the Developing World*. Glasgow: ITDG Publishing. Bell & Bain Limited.

- Holly, M. (2006). Environmental Virtue Ethics, a review of some current work. *Journal of Agricultural and Environmental Ethics*, Vol. 19, p. 391–424.
- Jenkins, W. (2009). *Berkshire encyclopaedia of sustainability: the spirit of sustainability*, Vol. 1 (1st ed.). Berkshire: Berkshire Publishing Group.
- Kymlicka, W. (1995). *Modern politisk filosofi*. Falun: Nya Doxa.
- Lele, S. M. (1991). *Sustainable development: A Critical Review*. <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/0305750X9190197P?via%3Dihub>
- Leopold, A. (1949). *A Sand County Almanac: And Sketches Here and There*. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Naess, A. (1973). The Shallow and the Deep. Long-Range Ecology Movement: A Summary. *Inquiry*, Vol. 16, p. 95–100.
- Partridge, E. (1984). Nature as a Moral Resource. *Environmental Ethics*, Vol. 6 (2), p. 101–130.
- Sachs, W. (2010). Environment. In W. Sachs (ed.). *The Development Dictionary: A guide to knowledge as power*. London, New York: Zed Books, p. 24–37.
- Shiva, V. (2010). Resources. In W. Sachs (ed.). *The Development Dictionary: A guide to knowledge as power*. London, New York: Zed Books, p. 228–242.
- Smuts, J. C. (1926). *Holism and Evolution*. New York: The Macmillan Company.
- World Commission on Environment and Development (WCED). (1987). *Our common future* Oxford: Oxford University Press, p. 43.
- Van Steenberg, B. (1990). Potential Influence of the Holistic Paradigm on the Social Sciences. *Futures*, Vol. 22(10), p. 1071–1083.

## FILOSOFINĖ DARNAUS VYSTYMOŠI KONCEPCIJOS ANALIZĖ

ERNESTA MOLOTOKIENĖ  
Klaipėdos universitetas (Lietuva)

### Santrauka

Pagrindinis straipsnyje atliktos filosofinės analizės tikslas – apibrėžti darnaus vystymosi koncepcijos filosofinius pagrindus. Esminį probleminį analizės lauką sudaro darnaus vystymosi koncepcijos filosofinės prasmės analizė, siekiant atskleisti šios sąvokos metafizinių, etinių ir ekologinių parametrų sinergiją. Šiame straipsnyje keliama problema – teigiama, kad tvaraus vystymosi koncepcija susijusi ne tik su žmonių, bet ir su pasaulio, kuriame jie gyvena, gerove, tad darnaus vystymosi koncepcija gali būti suprantama kaip holistinė filosofija, apimanti klasikines filosofines perspektyvas, taip pat harmonizuojanti ir integruojanti ekonominės, sociopolitinės ir ekologinės sistemų veiklą. Siekiama išanalizuoti ir atskleisti darnaus vystymosi koncepcijos formavimosi filosofinį kontekstą, išanalizuoti klasikinių etinių filosofijos teorijų reikšmę darnaus vystymosi koncepcijai, holistinį filosofinį požiūrį ir pagrįsti jo reikšmę darnaus vystymosi koncepcijai.

Teigiama, kad darnaus vystymosi koncepcija, tapusi konkrečiu šių laikų gerovės atskaitos tašku, kyla iš senovės Graikijos filosofų vartotos *arche* sąvokos ir išlaiko jai būdingą archajišką prasminį kontekstą. Problemos, su kuriomis susiduria darnaus vystymosi koncepcija, tokios kaip žmogaus veiksmų pasekmės ir vertinimas pasaulyje arba požiūris į gamtos išteklius ir jų išsaugojimą ateities kartoms, atsakingas buvimas pasaulyje ir kitos, iš esmės yra filosofinės, glaudžiai susijusios su klasikinėmis filosofijos teorijomis. Šiame straipsnyje nagrinėjamos klasikinės etinės filosofijos teorijos, atskleidžiamas jų ryšys su darnaus vystymosi koncepcija. Siekiant geriau suvokti etinių filosofijos teorijų principų reikšmę darnaus vystymosi koncepcijai, analizuojama klasikinių utilitarinės ir deontologinės etinių teorijų vertybių bei posūkio į holizmo filosofiją įtaka ir reikšmė. Holistinė filosofinė prieiga įgalina darnaus vystymosi koncepciją suvokti kaip sudėtingą ir daugialypę būties



plėtros viziją, įgalinančią darnų ekonominės, politinės, švietimo ir kultūros sričių veikimą, kuris neįmanomas, neįveiklinus klasikinių etinių vertybių, siekiant tvaraus žmonijos klestėjimo. Straipsnyje taikomi teoriniai filosofijos metodai: sisteminė mokslinės literatūros analizė, teorinė lyginamoji analizė, kritinio teksto rekonstravimas, teorinis apibendrinimas. Šie metodai leidžia pasiekti straipsnio tikslą ir įgyvendinti išsikeltus uždavinius.

Remiantis atlikta analize, galima teigti, kad klasikinės etinės filosofijos teorijos gali padėti priimti sprendimus, kurie užtikrintų darnų vystymąsi. Laikantis klasikinės etinio utilitarizmo teorijos, kuri įgalina maksimaliai išnaudoti visus turimus išteklius ir padidinti bendrą naudą, galima įžvelgti tiesioginį ryšį su darnaus vystymosi koncepcija. Kadangi utilitarizmas visus žmones, kartais ir nežmogiškas būtybes laiko lygiaverčiais moraliniais agentais, kurie gali būti vienodai naudingi, galima teigti, kad utilitaristinė pasaulėžiūra įpareigoja priimti atsakomybę už savo veiksmų pasekmes ir taip užtikrina būsimų pasekmių tvarumą. Remiantis deontologine etine teorija, veiksmai vertinami atsižvelgiant ne į jų pasekmes, o į tai, ar jie atliekami sąmoningai ir ar įmanoma juos universalizuoti. Tokia pasaulėžiūra įgalina apmąstyti ne tik veiksmus ir jų pasekmes, bet ir motyvus, siekiant darnaus žmonijos vystymosi. Filosofiniu požiūriu, darnus vystymasis šiais laikais gali būti suprantamas kaip holistinė etika, grindžiama darnios ekologinės sistemos vertės viršenybe ekonominės sistemos atžvilgiu. Holistinė filosofinė prieiga leidžia darnaus vystymosi koncepciją traktuoti kaip integralią ekonominių, socialinių-politinių ir ekologinių sistemų veiklą, kurios darniam veikimui ir iššūkių įveikimui būtinas vertybinis pagrindas bei atviras filosofinis dialogas.

PAGRINDINIAI ŽODŽIAI: *filosofija, darnus vystymasis, etinės teorijos.*

JEL KLASIFIKACIJA: B30, B55, D60, D78, I31.

*Received: 2020-04-10*

*Revised: 2020-04-30*

*Accepted: 2020-05-11*